

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

05PCT05

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005797

International filing date (day/month/year)

29.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

11.08.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

TOKYO ELECTRON LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005797

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005797

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☐ claims Nos. _____

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 22-25

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005797

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:

- ☒ paid additional fees
☐ paid additional fees under protest
☐ not paid additional fees

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

- ☐ complied with
☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

The inventions of the group of claims 1-25 are considered to be only related in the point of "accumulating detection information from a detection means and alarm information generated when an abnormality in the detection information is detected as processing history in an information accumulation part, acquiring information related to alarms that were selected from the alarms that occurred from the information accumulation part and displaying the information related to the acquired alarms", but this point is described in prior art documents, for example, [US, 2003-00223340, A1 (Toru Kitamoto), 30 January, 2003], and others, so that it cannot be a special technical feature.

And in view of the specific modes of the inventions described in the claims, the claims of this international application are considered to describe 11 inventions: [1, 2, 13 and 14], [3-5 and 15-17], [6 and 21], [7-9 and 18-20], [10], [11], [12], [22], [23], [24] and [25].

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

- ☐ all parts
☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-21

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/005797

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	1-21	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	1-21	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-21	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: US, 2003-0023340, A1 (Toru Kitamoto), 30 January, 2003 (30.01.03), Full text, Figures 1-20</p> <p>Claims 1-21</p> <p>The inventions of claims 1-21 do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 1 (Paragraphs [0077] – [0221] and Figures 1-20) describe outline information corresponding to each alarm, and also disclose the idea to store, in advance, an alarm table that is linkable to the processing history in the information accumulation part, let an alarm generation part generate an alarm when the detection means detected an abnormality, accumulate detection information detected by the detection means and alarm information generated by the alarm generation part when the detection means detected an abnormality as processing history of the processing device, acquire, from the information accumulated as processing history, sequential information leading to the generation of the alarms related to the selected alarms as link information, and display sequential information leading to the generation of the alarms including information selected from the alarm table and I/O information from the time before and after the alarm generation, and information including the measures to address the cause for the occurrence in a display means.</p>			